

REMARKS

Claim 1-6 are pending in the present application. Claims 1-3 stand rejected and claims 4-6 have been indicated to contain allowable subject matter. Additionally, objections were made to the drawings and claim 4. The specification was also objected to in paragraph [0030]. In this amendment, corrections are made to the specification and objected to claim 4. Also, claim 1 is amended by incorporating the limitations of claim 2 and claim 2 cancelled.

The objection to the drawing is respectfully traversed. The use of reference numeral 48 in paragraph [0021] was a typographical error, which has been corrected to read "49". Also, clarifications made in paragraph [0030] herein are believed to further clarify the description of that paragraph such that the objection under § 112 is obviated. Finally, language of claim 4 has been clarified to read as "cooperate" as suggested by the Examiner.

Claims 1-3 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as anticipated by Goodrich. This rejection is respectfully traversed. Goodrich does not, in fact, disclose the structure attributed to it as now recited in claim 1 of the instant application. For example, the tubular sleeve 42 and collar 90, which the Examiner alleges correspond to the claimed extension ring and reaction ring, are not configured as recited in the claim. Collar 90 is not installed on the valve spool in a manner that limits relative rotation between the valve spool and collar, as is recited for the reaction ring in claim 1 of the instant application. Also, the tubular sleeve and collar are not pressed together along a lateral face by spring 102 as alleged by the Examiner. In fact, sleeve 42 is formed in a single piece with flange 40 (Fig. 2 and col. 2, lns. 50-53) such that the action of spring 102 acts to force these parts apart, not together. The only place where there is contact between parts 42 and 90 is along a radial face, not a lateral face as claimed.

Moreover, collar 90 does not include a groove as required for the reaction ring of the present invention. The structure alleged to form claimed two control grooves (lips 86) is actual formed entirely on sleeve 42 (col. 4, lns 3-20), and not one on each of a reaction ring and an extension ring as recited in amended claim 1. Collar 90 has only a frusto-conical shoulder 96 (col. 3, ln. 60), not a groove as claimed. Additionally, flange 40 is not a valve cap as claimed because it is formed integrally with the tubular sleeve 42.

For all of these reasons, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1 and 3 are patentable over the cited references. It is also respectfully pointed out that the only amendment made to claim 1 was the incorporation of existing and previously presented limitations of claim 2. No


new limitations have been added to the claims by this amendment. Therefore, to the extent the Examiner may assert new grounds of rejection and/or new prior art in any subsequent action, such is not necessitated by applicant's amendment.

Accordingly, the present application is believed to be in condition for examination on the merits. Should the Examiner have any questions, then a telephone interview with the undersigned is respectfully requested to discuss any issues in any effort to accelerate the examination and allowance of this application.

A fee calculation sheet has been provided herein authorizing payment of the required additional claim fees. Please charge such fees to Morgan, Lewis & Bockius LLP deposit account No. 50-0310.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: June 30, 2005



Thomas D. Kohler
Morgan, Lewis & Bockius LLP
3300 Hillview Avenue
Palo Alto, California 94304
(415) 442-1106

32,797
(Reg. No.)